

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached replacement sheet includes changes to Fig. 8 and replaces the original sheet including Fig. 8.

In Fig. 8, minor typographical errors have been corrected.

Attachments following last page of this Amendment:

Replacement Sheet (1 page)
Annotated Sheet Showing Change(s) (1 page)

REMARKS

In response to the non-final Office Action of January 26, 2007, applicants ask that all claims be allowed in view of the amendment to the claims and the following remarks.

Claims 1, 3-22, 24,-28, and 30-34 are pending, with claims 1, 11, 22, and 28 being independent. Claims 2, 23, and 29 have been cancelled, and claims 1, 3-22, 24-28, and 30-34 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Support for the amendments can be found in the application at, for example, page 16, line 10 to page 23, line 29.

Objections to the Specification

The specification has been objected to for failing to define appropriately the acronyms ISP, PSTN, ISDN, and xDSL. Applicants have amended the specification to include parenthetical definitions of the acronyms ISP, PSTN, ISDN, and xDSL. In particular, applicants have amended the paragraph beginning at page 5, line 21 to define PSTN as "public switched telephone network," ISDN as "Integrated Services Digital Network," and xDSL as "digital subscriber line." In addition, applicants have amended the paragraph beginning at page 7, line 7 to define ISP as "Internet service provider."

Applicants note that the parenthetical definitions of the acronyms ISP, PSTN, ISDN, and xDSL incorporated into the specification are consistent with the definitions of the acronyms ISP, PSTN, ISDN, and xDSL provided in Webster's New World Computer Dictionary (Bryan Pfaffenberger ed., 9th ed. 2001).¹ In particular, Webster's New World Computer Dictionary defines ISP, PSTN, ISDN and xDSL as follows:

ISP Acronym for Internet service provider. Webster's New World Computer Dictionary at 203.

¹ Applicants' citation to Webster's New World Computer Dictionary (Bryan Pfaffenberger ed., 9th ed. 2001) is intended merely to provide support for the parenthetical definitions of the acronyms ISP, PSTN, ISDN, and xDSL incorporated into the specification by this amendment. Importantly, applicants' citation to Webster's New World Computer Dictionary (Bryan Pfaffenberger ed., 9th ed. 2001) is not intended to limit the definitions of the acronyms ISP, PSTN, ISDN, and xDSL, the disclosure, or the claims in any manner, nor is applicants' citation to Webster's New World Computer Dictionary (Bryan Pfaffenberger ed., 9th ed. 2001) intended to concede the propriety of relying on Webster's New World Computer Dictionary (Bryan Pfaffenberger ed., 9th ed. 2001) for the purpose of construing any other terms in the claims or the disclosure.

PSTN Acronym for public switched telephone network.
Webster's New World Computer Dictionary at 303.

ISDN Acronym for Integrated Services Digital Network.
Webster's New World Computer Dictionary at 202.

XDSL Abbreviation that refers to several Digital Subscriber Line (DSL) technologies, including asymmetric digital subscriber line (ADSL). Webster's New World Computer Dictionary at 398.

The specification also has been objected to because the trademarked term LINUX™ appears in the specification but is not capitalized appropriately. Applicants have amended the paragraph beginning at page 7, line 7 to recite the trademarked term LINUX™ in ALL CAPS.

For the reasons noted above, applicants request withdrawal of the objections to the specification.

Objections to the Drawings

An objection was made to the drawings for not complying with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5) for failing to include reference numerals included in the specification. In particular, reference numerals 4906, 4908, 4910, and 5360 are included in the specification but do not appear in the drawings. Applicants have amended the specification to remove reference numerals 4906, 4908, 4910, and 5360 from the specification.

An objection also was made to the drawings because of minor typographical errors appearing in Fig. 8. By way of this amendment, applicants are submitting a replacement sheet that replaces the original sheet including Fig. 8 and that corrects the minor typographical errors appearing in original Fig. 8.

For the reasons noted above, applicants request withdrawal of the objections to the drawings.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 11-14, and 16 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0046296 (Doss). Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 11 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1-4, 11-13, 14, and 16 because Doss fails to describe or suggest all of the subject matter of amended independent claims 1 and 11, as discussed more fully below.

As amended, independent claim 1 recites a graphical user interface that includes a window that includes both a contacts list and a file list. The contacts list lists one or more other users of the instant messaging service selected by the user as significant to the user and is configured to make online presence information for the other users perceivable to the user and to enable the user to initiate communication sessions with the other users. The file list lists one or more computer files that have been uploaded and stored on the host system by the user and is configured to enable the user to access the one or more computer files.

Doss does not describe or suggest a graphical user interface that includes a file list listing one or more computer files that have been uploaded and stored on the host system by the user and that is configured to enable the user to access the one or more computer files, as recited in independent claim 1.

Rather, Doss describes a calendar-enhanced instant messaging system in which information gleaned from users' electronic calendars is used to provide more accurate presence information for the users in other users' instant messaging participant lists. See Doss at Abstract. More particularly, Doss describes maintaining electronic calendars that track users' schedules throughout the course of a day and using the schedules stored in the electronic calendars to update the users' presence and contact information in other users' instant messaging participant lists. See Doss at paragraphs [0015]-[0017]. For example, referring to FIG. 7, when a user hovers over a screen name listed in the user's instant messaging participant list, enhanced presence information for the screen name over which the user is hovering is provided based on information gleaned from the screen name's electronic calendar. In particular, as illustrated in

FIG. 7, a status report, an immediate contact, an e-mail status report, a voice-mail status report, and an alternate contact are provided to the user. See Doss at FIG. 7.

Importantly, however, Doss fails to describe or suggest a graphical user interface that includes a file list listing one or more computer files that have been uploaded and stored on the host system by the user and that is configured to enable the user to access the one or more computer files, as recited in amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, for at least this reason, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of amended independent claim 1, and its dependent claims, claims 2-4.

As amended, independent claim 11 recites features similar to those discussed above in connection with amended independent claim 1, and does so in the context of a method. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above in connection with amended independent claim 1, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of amended independent claim 11 and its dependent claims, claims 12-14 and 16.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 22, 23, and 28-32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doss in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,725,269 (Megiddo). Applicants have amended independent claims 22 and 28 and request reconsideration and withdrawal of claims 22, 23, and 28-32 because none of Doss, Megiddo, or any proper combination of Doss and Megiddo describes or suggests all of the subject matter of amended independent claims 22 and 28.

As amended, independent claim 22 recites a graphical user interface that includes a contacts list listing one or more other users of the instant messaging service selected by the user as significant to the user and that is configured to make online presence information for the other users perceivable to the user and to enable the user to initiate communication sessions with the other users, and a links list listing one or more links to web pages that have been selected by the user for inclusion in the links list. In addition, the graphical user interface is configured to enable the user to select and share links listed in the links list with the other users listed in the contacts list.

The Office Action acknowledges that Doss fails to describe or suggest a graphical user interface that includes a list of links to data content that have been selected by the user, as recited in previously presented independent claim 22. See Office Action of January 26, 2007 at page 8, line 26 to page 9, line 1. Therefore, for this deficiency, the Office Action relies on Megiddo. See Office Action of January 26, 2007 at page 9, lines 1-6. Because Doss fails to describe or suggest a graphical user interface that includes a list of links to data content that have been selected by the user, it follows that Doss also fails to describe or suggest a graphical user interface that includes a links list listing one or more links to web pages that have been selected by a user for inclusion in the links list and that is configured to enable the user to select and share links listed in the links list with other users listed in a contacts list of the graphical user interface, as recited in amended independent claim 22. Notably, Megiddo also fails to describe or suggest a graphical user interface that includes a links list listing one or more links to web pages that have been selected by a user for inclusion in the links list and that is configured to enable the user to select and share links listed in the links list with other users listed in a contacts list of the graphical user interface, as recited in amended independent claim 22.

Rather, Megiddo describes a system that enables a user to maintain multiple identities for Internet browsing on the user's client computer and that enables the user to establish multiple Internet browsing reputations that correspond to the user's multiple identities for Internet browsing. See Megiddo at Abstract. For example, Megiddo describes maintaining an individual identity for a user by storing a list of several different web sites as well as corresponding user names and passwords that the user has registered with the web sites under the identity. See Megiddo at col. 8, line 64 to col. 9, line 9.

Thus, while Megiddo describes maintaining a list of several different web sites, Megiddo fails to describe or suggest a graphical user interface that includes a links list listing one or more links to web pages that have been selected by a user for inclusion in the links list and that is configured to enable the user to select and share links listed in the links list with other users listed in a contacts list of the graphical user interface, as recited in amended independent claim

22. Accordingly, for at least this reason, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of amended independent claim 22 and its dependent claim, claim 23.

As amended, independent claim 28 recites features similar to those discussed above in connection with amended independent claim 22, and does so in the context of a method. Accordingly, for at least the reasons discussed above in connection with amended independent claim 22, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of amended independent claim 28 and its dependent claims, claims 29-32.

Claims 5-10, 15, 17-21, 24-27, and 32-34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Doss in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,560,637 (Dunlap).²

Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5-10, which depend from amended independent claim 1, and claims 15 and 17-21, which depend from amended independent claim 11, because Dunlap does not cure the deficiencies in Doss noted above in connection with amended independent claims 1 and 11, nor does the Office Action contend that Dunlap does so.

Similarly, applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 24-27, which depend from independent claim 22, and claims 32-34, which depend from independent claim 28, because Dunlap does not cure the deficiencies in Doss and Megiddo noted above in connection with amended independent claims 22 and 28, nor does the Office Action contend that Dunlap does so.

Conclusion

Applicants submit that all claims are in condition for allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be

² Claims 24-27 and 32-34 depend from independent claims 22 and 28 respectively. Therefore, because independent claims 22 and 28 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Doss in view of Megiddo, applicants assume that claims 24-27 and 32-34 actually have been rejected as being unpatentable over Doss and Megiddo in view of Dunlap, rather than merely over Doss and Dunlap, as indicated by the Office Action. See Office Action of January 26, 2007 at page 5, lines 9-10.

Applicant : Mitchell C. Green et al.
Serial No. : 10/715,207
Filed : November 18, 2003
Page : 21 of 21


Attorney's Docket No.: 06975-510001 / AOL 204

exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

No fees are believed due. Please apply any other charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 26, 2007



Andrew T. Foy
Reg. No. 57,335

Customer No.: 26171
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331